

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/699,096	WYERS, PHILIP W.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Darren W. Ark	3643	

All Participants:

- (1) Darren W. Ark.
 (2) Michael R. Henson.

Status of Application: Re-opened after Appeal Brief

- (3) John W. Carpenter.
 (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 March 2006

Time: 5:00pm EST

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejections of the Non-Final Action 6/28/2005

Claims discussed:

1, 7

Prior art documents discussed:

Prior art of record including Winnicki 4,733,495

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**DARREN W. ARK
 PRIMARY EXAMINER**


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner stated that the rejections under appeal have been overcome after consideration of the Appeal Brief filed 3/4/2006, but Examiner stated that Winnicki 4,733,495 still applies to claims 1 and 7. Examiner stated that in regard to claims 1 and 7, Winnicki discloses a housing (see Fig. 1); a movable closure (86); evacuating air while retaining the closure in the closed position and through a sidewall of the housing (air goes out 24, 26); creating air pressure (see Fig. 5). Examiner also pointed out that Schuman 3,965,608 discloses evacuating air through a sidewall at the downstream region of the housing (at 35). Applicant and Examiner agreed with regard to claim 7, that the recitation "whereby a length of the housing from the compression chamber to the upstream end portion remains unchanged during the step of creating air pressure" be added at the end of paragraph (f) which sets forth the step of creating air pressure. Applicant also suggested with regard to claim 1, that the recitation "and whereby a distance between the movable closure and the downstream end remains unchanged during the evacuation of the air" be added to the end of paragraph (c). Examiner agreed with the proposed recitations since the movable closure (86) and upstream end portions of Winnicki move relative to the downstream end of the housing and the compression chamber during the steps of evacuating air and creating air pressure as evidenced in Figs. 2 and 5 of Winnicki. Examiner and applicant agreed that amendments to claims 1 and 7 are supported in the specification as originally filed and do not constitute or add new matter. Please see the Examiner's Amendment for details.